

REMARKS

In the outstanding official action, claims 8 and 10 were objected to because the phrase "the access device" was deemed to lack antecedent basis. In response, claims 8 and 10 are herewith amended to read "the medium access device", so that the objected-to recitation now reads as interpreted in the Action.

On the merits, claims 9, 10 and 15-25 were deemed to be allowable, while claims 1-7, 8 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tsuchiya '609, for the reasons of record. In response, independent claims 1 and 11 are herewith amended in order to more particularly and precisely recite the instant invention, and it is respectfully submitted that the currently-pending claims, as herewith amended, are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied art for the reasons detailed below.

At the outset, it was noted that the recitation of the limitation regarding the medium access device "being capable of changing the value in said address limit memory" was not considered a positive recitation and therefore not required to be shown in the prior art. In response, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to substitute "comprising means for" for the previous recitation of "being capable of", thus positively reciting the limitation in question.

More specifically, with regard to the rejection of independent claim 1, (and independent claims 4, 5, and 11, all of which were deemed to contain the same limitation as claim 1 and were rejected for the same reasons as set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1): It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 as herewith amended (and the remaining independent claims likewise rejected) contain subject matter which is clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied art. In particular, the now positively-recited limitation that the medium access device comprises means for changing the value in the address limit memory is respectfully submitted to be neither shown nor suggested in the cited art; as noted in the Action Tsuchiya discloses changing the layered boundary to coincide with the record data boundary (cell boundary). However, it is respectfully submitted that this limitation does not show or suggest the aforementioned specific and now positively-recited limitation that the medium access device must comprise means for changing the value in the address limit memory. In otherwords, whereas the reference provides a general teaching regarding a desired result (namely changing the boundary layer in a certain manner); the instant invention, as now more positively recited, is directed to specific structural means for changing the value in the address limit memory.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 10 are now in proper form,

and that claims 1-8 and 11-14 (in addition to allowable claims 9, 10 and 15-25) are now in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Steven R. Biren, Reg. 26,531
Attorney
(914) 333-9630